



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/645,248

08/20/2003

Mark Timothy Bennett

102792-158

7552

27389

7590

03/05/2010

PARFOMAK, ANDREW N.  
NORRIS MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS PA  
875 THIRD AVE, 8TH FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TRI V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/05/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/645,248	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BENNETT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> TRI V. NGUYEN	<b>Art Unit</b> 1796	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 16 February 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
 Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) rejected: 1-8 and 13-28.  
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 9-12.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
 13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Lorna M Douyon/  
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the amendment after final will not be entered because new independent claim 29 recites composition that only consist of the listed components was not presented prior to the final rejection and will result in the scope of the claims differing from the instant claims thus requiring further searches and/or considerations. /nvt/.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons stated in the final office action of 11/17/2009. In particular, applicants argue that the Zhou et al. reference teach ingredients that are not present in the instant claim - anionic pre-polymer or polymer and the absence of the Poliovirus reduction properties (page 9 et seq.). The examiner respectfully notes that the "comprising" language leaves the claim open for the inclusion of unspecified ingredients even in major amounts, see Ex parte Davis et al., 80 USPQ 448 (PTO Ed. App. 1948). Also, the broad "comprising" and "containing" terminology do not exclude the presence of other ingredients in the composition, unlike the narrow "consisting of" language, see Swain v. Crittendon, 332 F.2d 820, 14 USPQ 811 (CCPA 1964). The transitional term "comprising", which is synonymous with "including," "containing," or "characterized by," is inclusive or open-ended and does not exclude additional, unrecited elements or method steps. See, e.g., > Mars Inc. v. H.J. Heinz Co., 377 F.3d 1369, 1376, 71 USPQ2d 1837, 1843 (Fed. Cir. 2004) ("like the term comprising, 'the terms containing' and mixture' are open-ended."). Invitrogen Corp. v. Biocrest Mfg., L.P., 327 F.3d 1364, 1368, 66 USPQ2d 1631, 1634 (Fed. Cir. 2003). Genentech, Inc. v. Chiron Corp., 112 F.3d 495, 501, 42 USPQ2d 1608, 1613 (Fed. Cir. 1997) ("Comprising" is a term of art used in claim language which means that the named elements are essential, but other elements may be added and still form a construct within the scope of the claim).

Furthermore, It is noted that, according to MPEP 2173.05(i), the "mere absence of a positive recitation is not basis for an exclusion" - thus, the presence of anionic component is not precluded in the instant claims.

Regarding the absence of the Poliovirus reduction properties, the examiner notes that the court has held that that a material and its properties are inseparable (In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990)). It is noted that the references teach each of the claimed ingredients within the claimed proportions and pH ranges; thus, it is clear that similar compositions with similar ingredients in similar chemical environment would exhibit similar chemical behaviors - in the instant case, the same Poliovirus reduction. Regarding claim 25, though the "consisting of" language is restrictive of the claimed components, it is noted that the presence of optional components such as an antimicrobial agent is construed as an open-ended parameters that would allow for the anionic pre-polymer to be present as an antimicrobial agent.

Regarding claim 26, the "consisting essentially of" language does not necessarily exclude the anionic pre-polymer or polymer and the absence of the Poliovirus reduction properties because "consisting essentially of" renders the composition open to the inclusion of unspecified ingredients which do not materially affect the basic and novel characteristics of the composition, see Ex parte Davis et al. (Bd of Appeals), 80 USPQ 448. See MPEP 2111.03 [R3].

According to MPEP 2111.03 [R3], absent a clear indication in the specification or claims of what the basic and novel characteristics actually are, "consisting essentially of" will be construed as equivalent to "comprising." See, e.g., PPG, 156 F.3d at 1355, 48 USPQ2d at 1355./nvt/